

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

				_
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/937,777	10/01/2001	Satoru Ouchi	110700	7090
75	590 07/15/2004		EXAM	INER
Oliff & Berridge			CHERUBIN, YVESTE GILBERTE	
PO Box 19928				
Alexandria, VA	A 22320		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3713	

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	7
Advisory Action	09/937,777	OUCHI, SATORU	/
,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yveste G. Cherubin	3713	1
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addr	ess
THE REPLY FILED 04 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply n places the applicat	to a ion in
<u>PERIOD FOR RE</u>	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 Ci	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF f extension and the corresponding amon he shortened statutory period for reply se later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection IE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final C	n. See MPEP  priate extension priate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	•		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furthe	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	elow);		
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sim	plifying the
(d)  they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	i.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ion(s):		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	nmendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT	place the
<ol> <li>The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.</li> </ol>	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims wo			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,6-14,16-20,22-25 and 27-29</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ appr	oved or b)  disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	it(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10.  ☐ Other:			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Arguments are not persuasive for at least two (2) reasons. First, arguments are not commensurate in scope with the claims in that the claimed phrase beginning "wherein the second generating section generates ............according to a character controlled by a player in the game image data generated by the first generating section" is merely functionally recited in the claims and not limiting to any particular claimed structure. Alternatively, the Examiner also interprets the player to be "the character controlled by the player". No structure or definition of character is given in the claims to preclude this interpretation.

JESSICA HARRISON PRIMARY EXAMINER